REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 11-16 are currently pending, with claims 1, 8, and 14 being independent. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 11, and 14 have been amended, and claims 5, 9, and 10 have been cancelled. Support for the amendments can be found at least at paragraph 0033 of the specification, as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the interview conducted November 13, 2009 by applicants' undersigned representative. During the interview, various differences between the pending claims and the cited references were discussed. No agreement was reached with respect to the claims. Additionally, applicants' representative explained where support for the pending claims can be found in the specification. The Examiner agreed to withdraw the rejections of claims 8-13 for lack of enablement.

Claim Rejections

Claims 8-13 were rejected for lack of enablement because the claim term "based on a prediction of a user response to the candidate advertisements" was "not disclosed in the specification as filed and applicant is required to provide the exact column and lines where these limitations are disclosed." *See* office action at page 2. As discussed above, support for the feature of selecting an advertisement based on a prediction of a user response (i.e., based on a predicted click-through rate) can be found at least in paragraph 0033 of the specification as originally filed, which discusses using models "to maximize the likelihood of a click-through," where a click-through is a possible user response to an advertisement. This portion of the specification discloses that the predicted click-through likelihood (or rate) can be maximized based on consideration of the information currently recited in independent claims 1, 8, and 14.

Thus, in accordance with the agreement regarding enablement of this feature, and for the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the enablement rejections is requested.

Claims 1-3 and 8-14 were rejected as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 5,812,769 ("Graber"). Claims 4-7, 15, and 16 were rejected as being unpatentable over Graber. The rejections of claim claims 1-4, 6-8, and 11-16 should be withdrawn in view of the foregoing amendments to the claims, in which independent claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended to recite additional features and claims 5, 9, and 10 have been cancelled.

Additionally, as set forth in previous responses, Graber fails to disclose or suggest "selecting, by the advertisement server computer, an advertisement from among candidate advertisements," as recited in each of independent claims 1, 8, and 14. Particularly, Graber discloses a system that tracks which co-marketer website re-directed a user to the web page of an on-line service provider by forming a special destination URL having two parts when a user clicks on an advertisement for the on-line service included on a web page of a co-marketer. The first part of the special two-part destination URL is associated with the destination (i.e., the web page of the on-line service), and the second part is associated with the co-marketer who provided the referral. *See*, for example, col. 2, lines 39-42; col. 5, lines 34-48. The first part is associated with the destination, and the second part is associated with the co-marketer's web site 112a. Graber fails to disclose or suggest selecting advertisements, and in no way describes or suggests selecting an advertisement to send to a user node based on stored information about the user node. *See Id.*

Graber includes no information regarding selection of the advertisements displayed to the user at the co-marketer's web pages, and also includes no information regarding selection of advertisements to show to the user at the destination page. The office action cited col. 5, lines 25-54, which discusses the two-part destination URLs discussed above, as disclosing the feature of selecting an advertisement from among candidate advertisements based upon stored information about the user node and based upon stored information about the candidate advertisements because "an advertisement becomes an advertisement candidate for selection when a user clicks many times on a particular link or website so it is now a good candidate for selection since the user seems to like this link or website." *See* page 3 of the office action. As discussed above, this portion of Graber discusses a method of tracking a referring co-marketer,

and does not include any disclosure of advertisement selection from among candidate advertisements. Moreover, the position set forth in the cited portion of the office action appears to rely on the user's subsequent decision to interact with the system as a selection from among candidate advertisements. However, at the time when the user decides to interact with the system, only one advertisement is available to the user, i.e., the advertisement for the on-line service. Thus, the user's interaction with the advertisement for the on-line service cannot reasonably be construed as disclosing a selection of an advertisement from among candidate advertisements.

At least for this additional reason, the rejections of claims 1-4, 6-8, and 11-16 should be withdrawn.

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, issuance of a notice of allowance for all pending claims is requested. Should the Examiner identify any issues that may be addressed in an interview, applicants request that the Examiner contact applicants' undersigned representative.

Payment in the amount of $130.00 for the requisite fee for a one month extension of time is made on the Electronic Filing System by deposit account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7 December 2009

/George P. Bonanto/
George P. Bonanto
Reg. No. 59,717

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945